



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Of sympathy thou wert to me the voice, for thou alone  
Wouldst smile, when smiles were always sweet, while others could but frown ;  
My heart and harp are grateful still—for thus inspired by thee,  
They both have caught their tenderest tone—their sweetest minstrelsy !

We never more may meet on earth, or if again we meet,  
Less joyful all around may seem—less beautiful and sweet :  
A blight may sear the purest heart—and o'er the sunniest brow  
A shade may come—but can we mourn the thoughts we cherish now ?

It may be that a changing clime shall change thy beauty too,  
The clear, deep lustre of thine eye, so sweetly, softly blue !  
The richness of thy vermeil cheek, like rosy smile of even,  
But earth can never change the soul that breathes so much of heaven !

Far from thee be one painful sigh—from thee a shade of grief !  
And if a tear o'erflow thine eye, may it be bright and brief !  
But if upon thy absent friend thy memory oft may dwell,  
Say, will not many a tear-drop start—a sigh thy bosom swell ?

They may, they will—and when such shadowy moments come,  
These lines, like light reflected back, may chase away the gloom ;  
And, as thou musest, each may bring scenes beautiful and bright,  
That all of darkness and of gloom may flee before their light !

And should thou deem them worthy, dwell on these untutored lays,  
And should they bring to mind one thought of former happy days  
Thy soul so loves to rest upon—Oh ! sweet one, then impart  
Unto thy own soft sounding lyre the utterance of thine heart !

Its music o'er the western wave shall float upon mine ear,  
And sighs more low than roses breathe shall waft it faintly here ;  
And the lyre which thou hast strung for me shall echo back, and tell  
That the hand that sweeps, the sounds it breathes, are both unchang'd —

FAREWELL !

R. M.

#### PEERS, PEDIGREES, AND PAUPERS.\*

We have often thought, that as every country has some particular commodity for which it is remarkable, some curiosity for which it is famous—some disease for which it is proverbial—so may a people be notable for a propensity to and an aptitude for some science or art. In this way, Scotland may not only be mentioned for its skill on the pipes and its practice on the 'fiddle,' but for its metaphysics ; France, not only for its toys and its dancing, but also for the happy knack of its natives in memoir-writing ; Spain, not only for her raisins, but her romances ; so Ireland, we think, may claim celebrity not only for her potatoes, but her pedigrees, and for producing the most elaborate genealogies, and the most accommodating coat-of-arms-makers in the world. In fact, the genius of the people has a peculiar aptitude for such a field of study—so largely imaginative, and in no small degree self-sufficient—so fertile in feats, such as bards and senachies, rhymers and heralds, fasten on, the feuds of the field, the feasts of the hall. All such deeds, from the days of Con of the Hundred Battles and Nial of the Nine Hostages, have been celebrated by immortalizers such as Ireland only can boast of ; and therefore we can produce such genealogists as a Maolconery—as an O'Clery, a M'Naghtan, a Keatinge, an O'Flaherty, an O'Reilly—and, though last not least, the dignified and dignifying William Lynch, Esq.—the able, and yet independent—the erudite, and yet benevolent, as—

\* A View of the Legal Institutions, Honorary Hereditary Offices, and Feudal Baronies, established in Ireland during the Reign of Henry the Second. By William Lynch, Esq. Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, &c. &c. &c. London : Longman and Co.

sertor of feudal honours, the gilder-general of gingerbread coronets and coats of arms, and the caterer of titles for would-be lords in this land, where every Milesian must have an O attached to his name, in order to show himself the head of a sept, and where every Butler or Fitzgerald should be a king's noble, or at least a knight palatine. It was once said by a proud old English countess, who could trace her noble line to those who won their honours on the fields of Agincourt and Cressy, that now, since the Brunswick kings let the vessel of honour flow with so free a tap, that she could not put out her head at her coach window to cough, without spitting on an Irish lord. This her ladyship said at Bath, the peculiar habitat of our worthy Irish nobility. But, indeed, if her ladyship lived now-a-days in Dublin, she might make use of her emunctories without any danger of defiling the throng of nobility. Yes, we allow that here is one of the bad effects of the union ;—we are deprived of the beautiful presence of lords and ladies : coronets do not dazzle us on coach-panels ; nor are we often called on for such grandiloquence, as when addressing those we meet to say, ‘ my lord,’ or ‘ your ladyship.’ And, therefore, why should we not prize the efforts of William Lynch, Esq. ?—who, in his good-nature, has taken up the cause of certain poor gentlemen, who not having any trade, or art, or science, by which they can make an honest livelihood, desire, by means of his researches and discoveries, not only to possess the high privilege of being called ‘ my lord,’ and of being protected from arrest, but also have the happy opportunity, as pauper nobles, of drawing from the purse of the empire some hundreds a-year, in order to keep their aristocratic stomachs from being hungry. To be a genealogist a man certainly ought to have a genealogy of his own ; as no one should treat of poets or poetry but he who is a bard himself ;—and so who could write a history of our early poets so well as Tom Wharton—who could so eloquently descant on the sublimity of Homer as the sublime Longinus. In the same way, who is well fitted to unfold feudal baronies, and develop the rich tissue of hereditary offices, as a Lynch, sprung from one of the thirty tribes of Galway ?—a man who, doubtless, can trace his descent from Noah, Japhet, Magog, Finiusfarsa, Gadelas, Heber Scot, Bratha, Bille, Milesius, Heber and Heremon, and so on to the end of the chapter, that we dare not think of counting any further.

To be serious : it will be perceived, that the work before us is one of no small pretension. Indeed, a first peep into it, satisfied us that its author is a man of very great *promise*, flying his hawk at high quarry, even “ the origin of nobility, and such other ancient institutions, growing out of the past customs, feelings, and proceedings of mankind ;” and, therefore, “ the author must confess he also conceived that the circumstances under which British laws first found footing in so important a member of the empire—the persons who were instrumental in the introduction and establishment of those laws—the proceedings consequent upon that event—and the history of the system of nobility and public rights then founded, would form in themselves an interesting subject of literary inquiry.”—Pref.

In the hands of a man possessed of enlarged understanding and of the requisite information, well grounded in a knowledge of first principles, and able from these to draw just conclusions, the subject proposed would be fruitful in interest ; but, in those of an individual merely capable of reading the ancient *court*-hand in which the rolls in the office of the Chief Remembrancer of the Irish Exchequer are written, the undertaking is necessarily a failure.

Although "*the author*," as Mr. Lynch emphatically styles himself in almost every page of his book, "could never satisfactorily trace the origin of those ancient institutions, but by minute and extensive research through ORIGINAL LEGAL RECORDS," still he quotes most questionable evidence, and in many cases rubbish of the lowest order. In page 256, he introduces a stupid digression into his account of the family of Desmond—itself a very sorry performance—for the purpose of flattering a decent family of the name of Hacket, who, for aught we, or the family, know, descended from the Lord Paganus, or Lord Peter Hacket; but which we cannot believe one whit the more readily because the author has asserted but not proved it—since the evidence adduced is underived from any thing worthy of the title of "original legal records," and deserves not the slightest credit—viz. "the most ancient collection of heraldic emblazonments now remaining in Ireland, namely, the collection of Mr. Robertson of Dublin," in which "the arms (of Hacket) are to be found; but there is no tradition preserved explanatory of the crest, which, by that gentleman's valuable manuscripts, appears to have been 380 years ago as it is at this day," &c. &c. This is really too bad: and the author must be shallow-witted, indeed, to think that such bold-faced statements could pass, without examination, before the public. These MSS. of Robertson have been lately offered for sale in London, at our old friend Christie's; we took the trouble to examine them—and to us they appeared a collection of the veriest trash that could be bundled together. They consist of sketches, by one or more herald-painters, of arms and crests, full of blunders and false heraldry, not one of them being fifty years old, and many of them not a tithe of it—mere tricks of arms, with names, without residences or references to families—most of them, there is reason to believe, the sketches of Robertson and his brother and father, who were herald-painters in Dublin.

In chapter 10, "*On Claims for Peerages*," is given a copy of the Report of the Attorney and Solicitor General of Ireland, on the claim of a Mr. Garrett Butler to the title of Viscount Galmoy; and asserts, "that after the most careful research, it appears that no legal attainder was ever had in Ireland against the dignity which forms the subject of the above report." The ignorance which this assertion displays is very remarkable: the act of 10 William III. c. 5, which he himself quotes, attaints *Pierce Lord Viscount Galmoy by name*! The report alluded to is well drawn up, although we are not sure the concluding paragraph is justified by the evidence; but we cannot imagine what business this document has in a book treating of the institutions established in Ireland by Henry II.—unless for the purpose of eking out the volume, and, by a side-wind, to palm upon the public a would-be Lord and the noble house of Paddy Hacket! But we must admit that we are the less surprised at this, since this same *soi-disant* Lord Viscount has obtained the insertion of his pedigree in Mr. Burke's Peerage—in reference to which we would merely say, that if this gentleman wishes his work to rank with Debrett's, he should avoid giving place to mere pretenders to title where genuine nobility are alone professed to be admitted.

In his history of the Plunket family, which is a tissue of mistake or misstatement, shot through, however, with some small modicum of truth, the precise individual from whom in a long line (as the author asserts) the present Lord Plunket is descended, has been pointed out. We more than question whether the eminent nobleman alluded to will be duly thankful for the genealogical patronage which our author bestows upon his house—and we feel certain that the shining talents which

made a dissenting clergyman's son the Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, ennobles their possessor more truly, than any link which, in his ancestral chain, a clumsy hand may forge.

In his acknowledgments, the author says, "For the article on the hereditary DIGNITY of the BUTLERAGE, this work is principally indebted to the *Honourable William Butler*, whose knowledge of British and foreign dignities, and disinterested friendship, induced the author to seek his assistance, when treating of that dignity." May we ask, who the *Honourable William Butler* is? If we mistake not, he is the brother of a self-styled Lord, whose knowledge of the matter in hand is about as profound as the author's own. Mr. Lynch states, that "the office or dignity of the hereditary Chief Butler has been enjoyed by the ancestors of the Earl of Ormonde from *time immemorial*, and was *conferred* upon Theobald Walter, soon after 1170, by Henry the Second." We conceive the author is here involved in some little contradiction; for how could he say that the office was held from *time immemorial*, and at the same time fix the date of its *commencement*?—and in proof that it was no oversight on the part of the author, we need only mention that the words marked in Italics, appear in that character in his book. Now we must tell him that he is in error in both his assertions: the office was granted to Theobald Walter by John Earl of Morton, when lord of Ireland, and not by Henry II. We happened to be present in the Painted Chamber when the Earl of Ormonde proved his right, previous to the late coronation, and perfectly recollect the evidence then produced.

The author is not more happy respecting the Standard-bearer being "a dignity from time immemorial enjoyed without default or accusation *by the family of Wellesley*." It is true that very noble and ancient family held the manor of Dangen by the service of bearing a standard before the king, when he came to Ireland; but it is equally true that they acquired that manor by marriage with an heiress of Castlemartin. King Charles, in a new patent of the manor, changed the service to "*quando occasio offerat*." It is also a mere assertion of the author's, that the Marquis of Wellesley was allowed his rights and precedence at the coronation of his late Majesty, as HEREDITARY STANDARD-BEARER OF IRELAND. The Marquis of Wellesley did not claim it, and consequently it could not have been allowed him.

In a miscellaneous note on services (p. 107) we find the important information, that furred gloves, red roses, and goshawks, were received as rent! Why did he not make us acquainted with the equally strange fact, that land is held at a *peppercorn*?

Chapter V. on *Feudal Baronies*, is a compound of contradiction and ignorance of law, written in a jargon which defies comprehension. The object, however, appears to be to establish the position, that a different law governed the descent of peerages in Ireland, from that which governed it in England; and the author brings forward evidence in favour of his assumption, which to a common understanding would establish its converse. Relying on that bungling forgery, the "*Modus tenendi Parliamenti*," which has long been condemned and exploded, he strikes out a new species of argument from the *exemplification* of this Modus; for he says, the principle of *tenure* was strictly observed, and governed the parliaments since the reign of Henry V.; but he does not produce a single document from the proceedings of parliament, or from any other source, in which this Modus is even referred to—while it speaks of courts which did not exist in the reigns of the kings in which it

purports to have been written, and is full of anachronisms and absurdities.

It requires more than common patience to go through the whole of such a volume as this. If there were here and there some glimmer of common sense, the variety would refresh one; but to go step by step over an uninterrupted barren waste of false reasoning and illegitimate conclusion, is more than our nerves can well bear at this spirit-depressing season. In speaking of *Peerage by tenure*, the author says, "We have positive proof that baronies were enjoyed by tenure down to the middle of the 17th century! On the restoration of King Charles the Second, however, as all the estates of the nobility and gentry (it was ordered by the king's proclamation) should be allowed to remain in possession of those who enjoyed them on a certain day before his Majesty's happy return, and until such time as Parliament had assembled and provided for the general settlement of estates and interests in Ireland, *so the principle of tenure was waived of necessity on this occasion.* The first appearance of feudal Barons sitting in Ireland, therefore, who were not possessed of the estates to which *their dignities were incident or appendant, is to be found at this remarkable epoch in British history!*" How can we for a moment suppose that even this author could have penned such stuff in sober seriousness?—and if so, how utterly ignorant he must be of the history of the peerage! Peerages by tenure first discontinued in the reign of Charles II.—why, the decision in the reign of James I. declared that peerages by tenure, *if they ever existed, were then obsolete*, and were not fit to be renewed!

The author's chapter on *Subinfeudations* is equally accurate: take the following specimen. "SUBINFEUDATIONS of the LORD OF LEINSTER: The Barony of Ophaley conferred on the Fitzgerald family, afterwards Earls of Kildare and Dukes of Leinster," &c. Now, be it known unto all men, that this barony of Ophaley was *not conferred* on the Fitzgerald family by subinfeudation of the Lords of Leinster, but was *inherited* by the Fitzgeralds in consequence of the marriage of Maurice Fitzgerald with Agnes de Valentia, daughter and coheir of William Earl of Pembroke, one of the heirs of the Lord of Leinster, in the reign of Henry III. Ophaley and Geshil being that portion of her father's inheritance which was allotted to her; it was not a subinfeudation at all, but a part and parcel of the kingdom of Leinster, and was held of the crown in chief. So much for our author's accuracy in this particular.

Every opportunity is seized to enumerate the list of Irish *feudal titles*, as Ophaley, Arklow, Kingsale, &c.; and much stress is laid upon King James's extraordinary decision, in giving Lettice, the heir-general of the Earl of Kildare, the title of Baroness Ophaley *for life*, and that after her death it should go to the Earl of Kildare. James made many illegal decisions; but he was right in giving the title of Ophaley to the Earl of Kildare—for it had been granted by *patent* to his ancestor, by Philip and Mary, with remainder to his heirs male, when the earldom was restored after the attainder. The old barony of Ophaley, which had come into the family by Agnes de Valentia, went off in a female long before the circumstance just alluded to; and the only barony of Ophaley then *in esse* was that entailed on the heirs male by the patent of Philip and Mary.

The old barony of Arklow was resumed in tenure by the Act of Absentees, 28 Henry VIII. from the heir-general of the Earl of Ormond. The Lord of Kingsale cannot trace a continuous pedigree beyond the time of Richard II. and may have been created by patent, after the

introduction of the practice in that reign, which is a much more rational way of accounting for the descent of that peerage in the male line, than the theory of a peculiar custom governing the descent of Irish peerages, or the still more absurd idea, that the subinfeudatory barons of a palatine could ever, as such, have been lords of Parliament, or owed service in the court of the lord paramount of the palatinate—viz. the king.

The following are given by the author as the principal parliamentary baronies, which have been inherited by heirs male to the exclusion of heirs general: Arklow, Athenry, Barrymore, Clanrickard, Delvin, Dunboyne, Dunsany, Fermoy, Gormanstown, Howth, Killeen and Rathregan! Kinsale, Lixnaw or Kerry, Ophaley, and Slane. Of these we have already disposed of three—viz. Arklow, Kinsale, and Ophaley. We now proceed with the others in order.

**ATHENRY**—This title was declared by the law officers, the Prime-Sergeant and the Attorney and Solicitor-General, in the year 1800, to be in abeyance among the coheirs of the late Thomas Earl of Louth.

**BARRYMORE** is now in the Marquis of Waterford, as heir general.

**CLANRICKARD**—In page 341, the author gives a document from the State Paper Office, London, containing a list of the peers of Ireland at the Parliament which made Henry VIII. King of Ireland; to which are added six names of Irish chiefs, and among them this very lord, under the name of "*Will. de Burgo sui nationis capitaneus*." Attached is this note, "*Isti nondum sunt de Parlamento*." So much for this title as a parliamentary barony before the creation of the earldom of Clanrickard.

**DELVIN**—This title, originally a palatine barony of Meath, the possessor of which, previous to being summoned as a peer, often represented that county in parliament, was also declared to be a barony in fee and in abeyance, about the same time as Athenry, by the Irish law officers of the crown, whose opinion, we conceive, is almost as good as that of our author.

**DUNBOYNE**—A palatine barony of Meath, created a peer by patent, by Henry VIII. as stated by this accurate book-maker himself.

**DUNSANY**—a manor inherited by a younger branch of the Plunkets, by marriage with the heir general of Richard Earl of Kildare, who had the manor by marriage with the heir general of Castlemartin.

**FERMOY**—Inherited by the Roches by marriage with an heir general of Cantillon.

**GORMANSTOWN**—Sir Robert Preston purchased this manor from Almaric de St. Amand, in 1363, and became a peer by summons and sitting. His heir was afterwards created a Viscount.

**HOWTH**—This lord became a peer by summons after Henry IV.

**KILLEEN**—In this case, our admirable author supplies evidence to confute his own theory, by showing that Christopher Plunket, a younger son, inherited it by marriage with the heir general of Tuit, who obtained it by sitting under a summons. If they were lords of Rathregan, they obtained it by marriage with the heir of Le Blound, according to our author.

**LIXNAW OR KERRY**—The heir general has also been the heir male in this family; it therefore affords no evidence either way.

**SLANE**—Originally a palatine barony of Meath, made a peer by summons and sitting; went into abeyance repeatedly, and was revived in the heir male—now claimed by Mr. Bryan of Jenkinstown, as sole heir general of the last Lord Christopher, whose case is now under investigation.

We have now disposed of our author's whole stock in trade, and, we think, to our readers' satisfaction refuted all his fine theories of peculiar laws and customs. Having bestowed so much attention on the legal and theoretic part of the gentleman's production, we own we have neither time nor stomach to carve up duly those specimens of curiously-cooked absurdity, which his histories of the Desmonds and the Plunkets present. Suffice it to say that they are in keeping with the other portions of the veracious and well digested volume.

Chapter XI. consists of copies of records, of writs, of military and parliamentary summonses, proofs of sittings, fines for absence, &c. and is really the only valuable portion of the book, occupying seventy-one pages. The ill-starred author, however, ventures to introduce, in a note to page 341, some observations of *his own*, in which he cavils at certain lists of the parliaments of the 2d and 27th of Elizabeth, which were offered in the House of Lords as *parliament pawns*, because they were not in all respects similar to those kept in the Petty-bag-office, Chancery-lane, London, which this sapient one says were lists made out of peers, &c. as was usual in such cases, &c. whereas these documents do not contain the list of the Privy Council, &c. as all parliament pawns do, but enumerate the Lords summoned and the Commons elected and returned. Let us look (as our author says) at the documents themselves, and we shall find that that of the 27th Elizabeth is a list of "The Lords spiritual and temporal, counties, cities, and borough towns as are answerable to the parliament in this realm of Ireland, and such as were summoned unto the parliament," &c. to which the names of the Commons were added after election. And what does this prove? Why, merely, that as there is no such office in Ireland as the *Petty-bag office*, and that the method of making up a parliament pawn in Ireland differed from that in England, nothing more. We wonder the non-existence of a Petty-bag office was not quoted as evidence of the variance of the common laws and customs of the two countries. Will the author inform us of the meaning of the words *parliament pawn*?

We have not the means of referring to the original roll, but we venture to say, that the extract from the Chancery roll of 1 Jac. I. is not accurate. He has it, "*Teste MEIRSO apud Dublin.*" James never was in Dublin. Another instance of the author's accuracy is to be found in his silly note, page 355, in which he gives the list of the peers from the journals of the House of Lords of Ireland, of 14th July, 1634, and says, "The names of the peers who still sat as feudal barons, or who being advanced by patent to higher honours, still enjoyed feudal baronies, will be found printed in Italics."

*Earl of Desmond* infra etat.—The author, of course, considered that there could be no Earl of Desmond but a *Fitzgerald*; and although he had himself pretended to give an accurate account of this family, and had quoted the statute of the 28th of Elizabeth, which attainted and annihilated the dignity—he yet restores it in the person of James, son to the attainted nobleman, and the heirs male of his body; but, in the same page (259) he kills him without issue. Notwithstanding, in the year 1634, our author, by an extraordinary self-endowed power, not only reverses the attainder, but does more—he restores to life and animation the *feudal Earl of Desmond*, and brings him into Parliament! But this is a small matter in the hands of this most privileged book-maker—this able criticiser of Sir John Davis and other historians and lawyers, and of the editor of the "New Edition of Statutes," whom he accuses of "want of discretion in undertaking to write an introduction



to the statutes of England, without being qualified." Now the Earl of Desmond of 1634 was George Fielding, ancestor to the present Earl of Denbigh and Desmond, a nobleman who was so far from being a feudal earl in Ireland, that we find that neither he nor his ancestors ever had a foot of land there. How inordinate and disgusting, then, must that vanity and presumption be, which could induce a man to set himself up as a critical accuser, on the ground of want of qualification and discretion, when he himself manifests the blindest temerity and the grossest ignorance in the difficult matter he has undertaken to manage!

It is easy to perceive, that this goodly author is most unfortunate whenever he strays out of the mill-horse business of copying documents in the Chief Remembrancer's office: if he ventures to another depository of antiquated parchments, or pens any thing original, it is sure to be erroneous. In page 359, he hazards a note, in which he attempts to insinuate that the persons summoned by James the Second to his pretended parliament were and are real and *bona fide* peers. At least, if he means any thing—which it is frequently difficult to find out—it is this. But let him speak for himself: "The only writs of parliamentary summonses creating hereditary peerages by express words, that have as yet been discovered in England or Ireland, are the three following, and that by which Henry the Sixth created Henry Bromflete, Knight, Baron de Vesey, in the year 1449. It is worth observing, that although the other writs of James's Parliament, as well as the proceedings had therein, were by order withdrawn from the depository where they should have been preserved; yet the three following writs remain duly enrolled on the patent rolls; and there is also to be found additional evidence in the public records, that the titles of Barons Nugent and Fytton were duly recognised. From these and other circumstances it appears, it was only during the excesses naturally flowing from an *unexpected revolution*, that those honours were afterwards prohibited and denied. Now, however, that we can *reason* on such subjects, it is right to state, that according to the laws and usages of dignities and parliaments in Ireland, and the powers and rights exercised by the kings of England from time immemorial in that country, the legality of such a creation CANNOT BE QUESTIONED." He then gives the writs of James the Second, calling to his parliament Sir Alexander Fytton, Knt. as a peer, and willing that he and the heirs male of his body should be Barons Fytton of Gosworth (Gosworth)—Thomas Nugent and the heirs male of his body, to be Barons Nugent of Riverstown—and John Bourke and the heirs male of his body, to be Barons Bophin.

What means the author by this? Is he willing to give up all his former nonsense about feudal peers of parliament, and sitting by tenure and prescription, and to admit the creation of peers of Ireland by summons?—or is it a ridiculous insinuation in behalf of our old friend Billy Nugent, who is universally laughed at as one of James's abortive peers, assuming the dignity of Lord Riverstown. We are inclined to think that the latter is his object, since it is in accordance with the other parts of his precious production, and with his sage remarks on the report of the Attorney-General on the Galmoy claim. In fact, this gentleman would seem to be the protector-general of all pretended peers, whose *disinterested friendship* has induced him to write this book for their benefit; and no doubt he has received much assistance therein from others besides the *Honourable* William Butler, whom he lauds so highly in his preface.

We now take our leave of Mr. Lynch, whose extraordinary work we

unquestionably should not have noticed, were it not that we wished to warn certain poor gentlemen against being tempted, by the plausibility of pedigree-makers, to seek for honours and claim titles which they would be much better without. Besides which, we feel that if such worthies as Mr. Lynch have no more substantial grounds for the exertion of their industry and research, than in fitting genealogical tails to paper kites, they would (to use an Irish licence of the pen) be much more profitably *employed in doing nothing*. For, though it is very conceivable what a good thing it must be for a poor child of Adam, in his generation, to strut through life as a great territorial lord, such as the Duke of Northumberland, or the Earl of Grosvenor, or the Duke of Leinster, and so forth; so we cannot imagine any thing so wretched, so pitiful, so provoking, as to see a proud pauper furnished with a title by means of such men as Mr. Lynch, sneaking about through the world, encumbered by a name which sets looking-glasses around all his poverty, and throws a glare on all his wretchedness. Some of our readers may think, that in the course of our observations we have been unusually severe upon the author and his book. But, in addition to the causes already mentioned, we must own that the natural evenness of our temper was ruffled, and our indignation aroused by the haughty, magisterial, and coxcombical diction and *ex-cathedra* manner of this Deputy Chief Remembrancer of his Majesty's Exchequer—this ex-reporting officer of the land revenue.

## SONGS FOR THE SORROWFUL—No. II.

I hear thy voice—I hail the light  
That sparkles still around thee,  
As softly lustrous, calmly bright,  
As when my young heart found thee,  
Unseen, unknown, unsought—and woo'd  
My Mary's gentle maidenhood!

What wert thou then? A lovely thing!  
A flower the storms had pass'd,  
That knew nor wind nor withering;  
A hidden stream, that fast  
Flows onward, seen and known of none,  
Yet harping wild strains though alone!

What art thou? Is thy placid cheek  
Less lovely? or thine eye—  
That deep blue eye—less brightly meek?  
The Vesper of my sky!  
I know not—charms may still be thine—  
I only know thou art not *mine*!

Too lovely lost one! Days may pass,  
A heart that lov'd may dream  
It still can be what once it was!  
And hope hath many a beam  
To gild with mocking ray an hour,  
Like sunshine on a faded flower.

Vain fancies! But let maniacs weave  
Their straw-crowns, and they reign!  
And with the soulless laugh relieve  
Those Gods—the blest insane!  
(*All life is madness—I would share*  
That happy kind which frees from care!)